

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Office Action dated August 10, 2007. All rejections of the Examiner are respectfully traversed. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 12 and 23 have been amended herein. Support for the amended claims is found throughout the Specification as originally filed. For example, support for the amended independent claims is found in lines 8-31 on page 7 of the Specification. Support for newly added dependent claims 33 and 34 is found on page 7 in lines 14-17. No new matter has been added.

At paragraphs 1-3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 12 and 14-23 for non-statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101. Amendments to claims 12 and 23 herein are respectfully believed to satisfy all requirements of the Examiner in this regard. As noted in the Office Action, the undersigned Attorney discussed the present “circuitry” amendments to claims 12 and 23 with Examiner Sun in a telephone conversation on July 20, 2007. These amendments were approved at that time as Examiner’s amendments to overcome such non-statutory subject matter rejections, but were not entered.

At paragraphs 4-7 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 9, 10, 12, 20, 21 and 23 for anticipation under 35 U.S.C. 102, based on United States patent number 6,054,846 of Castleman (“Castleman”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Castleman discloses a universal power-supply connection system for multiple electronic devices. The Castleman system accepts electronic-device identification information for particular devices, and includes one or more programmed digital electronic microprocessors that use the identification information to select device power parameters for the devices. A cable in

Castleman may store the identification information in a ROM, PROM, EPROM or other memory chip in one of its end connectors, from which the identification information is read by a system microprocessor before power is supplied to the connected device.

Nowhere in Castleman is there disclosed or suggested any method of connecting a device to a central system, including:

- detecting the insertion of a cable connector into a slot in said central system, wherein said cable connector is integral to a cable that is terminated by said cable connector, wherein said cable is communicably connected to said device at an opposite end of a cable from said cable connector;

- reading, through said slot, configuration information stored in a memory contained within said cable connector, wherein said configuration information includes a value describing a type of said device;

- configuring said central system in response to said configuration information read from said memory contained within said cable connector;

- modifying, by said central system, said value describing said type of said device;*
and

- writing said modified value describing said type of said device from said central system through said slot, wherein said writing causes said modified value describing said type of said device to be stored into said memory contained within said cable connector.* (emphasis added)

as in the present independent claim 1. Independent claims 12 and 23 include analogous features. In contrast, Castleman teaches a system solely concerned with *reading* electronic-device identification information data from a memory contained in a connector. Thus Castleman includes no hint or suggestion of even the desirability of dynamically modifying a value describing a type of a device that was read from a memory in a cable connector, and then writing the modified value back to the memory of the connector, as in the present independent claims. The device identification information stored in the cable connector of Castleman is instead statically defined, and is not modified or written by the system microprocessor. As a result, Castleman does not operate in any way to dynamically reconfigure the contents of the cable connector memory by writing a modified value describing a type of device to the cable connector

memory from the central system, as is advantageously provided by the present invention, and as expressly set forth in independent claims 1, 12 and 23.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully urges that Castleman does not disclose or suggest all the features of the present independent claims 1, 12 and 23. Accordingly, Castleman does not anticipate independent claims 1, 12 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 102. As to claims 9, 10, 20, and 21, they each depend from claims 1 and 12, and are respectfully believed to be patentable over Castleman for at least the same reasons.

At paragraphs 8-14 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 5, 9-12, 16 and 20-23 for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 based on the combination of published United States patent application 2002/0136038 of Spitaels et al. ("Spitaels et al."), United States patent 6,131,125 of Rostoker et al. ("Rostoker et al."), and Castleman. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As noted in the previous response, Spitaels et al. disclose an uninterruptible power supply and a multipurpose data port that facilitates a plurality of communication methods between the uninterruptible power supply and a host computer system. A multipurpose data port of Spitaels et al. is configured to prevent interference if a user mistakenly connects a phone line or other similar but inappropriate line to the uninterruptible power supply.

As also previously noted, Rostoker et al. disclose a protocol translation cable assembly including translation circuitry coupled to at least some of a plurality of wires of the cable at points between pins of a first connector and pins of a second connector. The Rostoker et al. cable assembly provides "plug-and-play" capabilities where the cable communicates with a first communication protocol at a first end, and with a second communication protocol at the second

end, for example by way of translation between a USB communication protocol at one end and an Ethernet communication protocol at the other end.

Applicant respectfully urges that the combination of Spitaels et al. and Rostoker et al. with Castleman fails to disclose or suggest any method or system for connecting a device to a central system that includes:

detecting the insertion of a cable connector into a slot in said central system, wherein said cable connector is integral to a cable that is terminated by said cable connector, wherein said cable is communicably connected to said device at an opposite end of a cable from said cable connector;

reading, through said slot, configuration information stored in a memory contained within said cable connector, wherein said configuration information includes a value describing a type of said device;

configuring said central system in response to said configuration information read from said memory contained within said cable connector;

modifying, by said central system, said value describing said type of said device;
and

writing said modified value describing said type of said device from said central system through said slot, wherein said writing causes said modified value describing said type of said device to be stored into said memory contained within said cable connector. (emphasis added)

as in the present independent claim 1. Independent claims 12 and 23 include analogous features. In contrast, Castleman teaches only reading of device identification information from the cable connector, and the multipurpose dataport of Spitaels et al. includes no memory for storing information of any kind. Additionally, the communication protocol driver of Rostoker et al. is used only to configure *protocol translating circuitry* within the cable. Nothing in either Castleman, Spitaels et al. or Rostoker et al. teaches or suggests even the desirability of dynamic reconfiguration accomplished by modifying a value describing a type of a device that was read from a memory in a cable connector, and then writing the modified value back to the memory of the connector, as in the present independent claims 1, 12, and 23.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully urges that the combination of Castleman with Spitaels et al. and Rostoker et al. does not disclose or suggest all the features of the present independent claims 1, 12 and 23. Accordingly, the combination of Castleman with Spitaels et al. and Rostoker et al. does not support a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 with regard to claims 1, 12 and 23. As to claims 5, 9-11, 16 and 20-22, they each depend from claims 1 and 12, and are respectfully believed to be patentable over the combination of Castleman, Spitaels et al. and Rostoker et al. for at least the same reasons.

At paragraphs 15-21 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 3, 4, 6-8, 14, 15 and 17-19 for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103, again citing Castleman, Spitaels et al. and Rostoker et al., and additionally citing United States patent number 6,081,782 of Rabin ("Rabin").

As discussed above, Castleman, Spitaels et al. and Rostoker et al. fail to disclose or suggest dynamic reconfiguration accomplished by modifying a value describing a type of a device that was read from a memory in a cable connector, and then writing the modified value back to the memory of the connector from the central system, as in the present independent claims 1 and 12. This shortcoming of the combination of Castleman, Spitaels et al. and Rostoker et al. is not remedied by further combination with the teachings of Rabin, which includes a description of a database to store speech models and other user information in column 4. Accordingly, the combination of Castleman, Spitaels et al., Rostoker et al., and Rabin also fails to disclose or suggest dynamic reconfiguration by modifying a value describing a type of a device that was read from a memory in a cable connector, and then writing the modified value back to the memory of the connector, as in the present independent claims 1 and 12, from which claims 3, 4, 6-8, 14, 15 and 17-19 depend.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully urges that the combined teachings of Castleman, Spitaels et al., Rostoker et al. and Rabin fail to disclose all the features of the present independent claims 1 and 12. Accordingly, the combination of Castleman, Spitaels et al., Rostoker et al. and Rabin does not form a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to independent claims 1 and 12, and dependent claims 3, 4, 6-8, 14, 15 and 17-19 are respectfully believed to be patentable over the combination of Castleman, Spitaels et al., Rostoker et al. and Rabin for at least the same reasons.

Reconsideration of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned, Applicants' Attorney at 617-630-1131 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

February 6, 2008
Date

/David Dagg/
David Dagg, Reg. No. 37,809
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
44 Chapin Road
Newton, MA 02459
(617) 630-1131

Docket No. 250-002